Remarks

The Examiner found claims 5, 9, 16, 20, 25 and 26 to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly:

The limitations of dependent claim 5 have been incorporated into base claim 1; there were no intervening claims. Original dependent claim 5 was thereafter cancelled. Original dependent claim 4 was also cancelled because it became redundant of amended claim 1.

Claim 9 has been written in independent form including the limitations of original base claim 1; there were no intervening claims.

The limitations of dependent claim 16 have been incorporated into base claim 12; there were no intervening claims. Original dependent claim 16 was thereafter cancelled. Original dependent claim 15 was thereafter cancelled because it became redundant of amended claim 12.

Claim 20 has been written in independent form including the limitations of original base claim 12; there were no intervening claims.

The limitations of dependent claim 25 and intervening claim 24 were incorporated into original base claim 23. Original dependent claims 24 and 25 were thereafeter cancelled.

Claim 26 was amended to depend on amended claim 23 (instead of dependent claim 25).

Original claims 27-29 were cancelled.

New independent claim 30 is in program product form and is analogous to allowed method claim 9.

Based on the foregoing, the present patent application, as amended above, should be allowable.

Respectfully submitted,

Arthur Samodovitz
Reg. No. 31,297